

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III.

SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1834.

NO. 36.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK
AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY
T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.
Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

[Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1834, by P. PRICE, in the Clerks Office of the Southern District of New-York.]

ANSWERS TO

"213 Questions without Answers,"

By D. De Vinne,
WITH REJOINDERS,
By A. C. Thomas.

170. If it be *certain* that *one* soul will be saved, must there not be a decree concerning the salvation of a *definite, fixed* number?

A. No. See on No. 169.

171. If the number of the saved be *definitely fixed*, must not the number of the damned be equally definite?

A. Their number may be known as the effect of their own actions, but it was never fixed by any decree of God.

Rej. So far as our present inquiry is concerned, it matters not by what means the final destiny of man be brought about. If there be any certainty in reference to the final destiny of *one* individual, there must be equal certainty in relation to the destiny of each member of the human family. Consequently, on the system of Arminianism, a *definite, fixed* number of persons will *certainly* be saved, and an equally definite, fixed number of persons will just as *certainly* be damned!

You may allege, if you please, that these opposite destinies are fixed by the actions of the parties respectively—nevertheless the state of the case is not varied. If any man be finally lost, it was *certain* a million years ago that such would be his doom. God cannot know that an event will *certainly* take place, if there be any *possibility* that said event may *not* take place. If you say that God's knowledge does not affect the destiny of any man, I answer, that such destiny is not the less certain on that account.

The system of Arminianism may be stated in the language of Calvinistic Confessions of Faith, slightly altered: "God from all eternity foreknew that some men and angels would, by their own exertions, certainly be saved; and that other angels and men, in consequence of the certain abuse of their agency, would certainly be damned. These angels and men, whose opposite destinies were thus foreknown, are particularly and unchangably designed; and the number of each class is so certain and definite that it cannot be either, increased or diminished."

In this view of the case, I see not why the eternal condition of men should be made a matter of interest and anxious exertion by our Arminian friends. They can maintain consistency in no other way than by allowing, that while God certainly knows what the final state of each individual will be, he also knows that the certainty of that final state is dependent on the certainty that the proper exertions will be made to bring it about. And a farther concession must be made, namely, that nothing pertaining to man's final estate is matter of uncertainty. This plain conclusion most obviously demands the assent of the mind, either to Calvinism on the one hand, or to Universalism on the other.

172. If there be *no certainty* in relation to the final destiny of man, is not salvation a work of *chance*?

A. But there is certainty, and that too without necessity or decrees.

Rej. Then from what does the certainty spring? If it be said that it springs from the actions of the creature, a farther question is provoked—Is there any certainty as to the works of the creature? If there is, from what does this certainty spring? And if there is *not*, it is worse than folly to talk about certainty in relation to the final destiny of man. The certainty of an *end*, depends on the certainty that the proper means will be used.

173. What better is *chance* than *Atheism*?

A. It is not.

Rej. Then surely *Arminianism* is no better than *Atheism*—for I have abundantly shown that this system is uncertain in all its bearings—uncertainty is nothing but *chance*—and he who argues in favor of *chance-work* in the Divine government, is *virtually* *Atheistical* in the ground-work of his faith, however much he may be startled at the thought.

174. If God *knew*, when He created, what the end of each soul would be, is not that end as *certain* as if it was *decreed*?

A. We will allow that it is; but then who made it certain, God or the creature? The foreknowledge of the former had no influence whatever upon that end; but the free unrestrained actions and volitions of the latter *had*, and actually brought it about, and made it certain. See this largely answered on Nos. 77, 80 and 169.

But dear sir, you appear to have a wrong notion of creation, by intimating that the existence of each soul, is effected by a *separate and immediate* act of creative power; whereas the Scriptures favor the idea that the human soul is *ex traduce*, by *natural descent*; so that by preventing the existence of one who might abuse his liberty, God would have prevented the existence of *millions* who would not and who might have been happy in heaven. The last quoted writer in his usual felicitous style, represents the Deity as expostulating with an objector—"Thou art ready to think hard of my wisdom, goodness or foresight for giving a talent of saving grace to a man who would bury it. I foresaw indeed, that the slothful, unfaithful man, to whom I gave one talent, would bury it to the last: but if I kept it from him, if I had afforded him *no opportunity* of showing his faithfulness or his unfaithfulness; what could I have done with him? Had I sent him to hell upon *foreseen* disobedience, I should have acted the absurd and cruel part of a judge who hangs an honest man to day, under pretence that he foresees the honest man will turn thief to morrow:—had I taken him to heaven, I should rewarded *foreseen unfaithfulness* with heavenly glory. And had I refused to let him come into existence, my refusal would have been attended with a glaring absurdity, and with two inconveniences. 1. With a glaring absurdity; for if I foresee that a man will *certainly* bury his talent; and if upon this foresight, I refuse that man existence it follows, I *foresaw* that a thing which shall *never* come to pass, shall *certainly* come to pass. And what can be more unworthy of me, and more absurd than such a foresight? 2. The notion that my foreknowledge of the man's burying his talent, should have made me suppress his existence, is big with two inconveniences.—For first, I should have defeated my own purpo-

ses, which was to show my *distributive justice* by rewarding him if he would be faithful; or by punishing him, *if he would* continue in his unfaithfulness. And secondly, I should have broken, almost without interruption, the laws of the natural world, and nipped the man's righteous posterity in the bud. Had I, for instance, prevented the wickedness of the ancestors of the Virgin Mary, by forbidding their existence ten times over, I might have suppressed her useful being and my own important humanity. Nay, at that rate I might have destroyed all mankind ten times over. Drop then thy prejudices; be not wise above what was written for thy instruction."

Rej. For a sufficient notice of all that the foregoing Answer contains in relation to certainty, the reader is referred to preceding Rejoinders. The respondent acknowledges, what indeed no one feels disposed to deny, that "if God knew, when he created, what the end of each soul would be, that end is as certain as if it was decreed." He admits the certainty that a *definite, a fixed* number will be saved, and that an equally definite, fixed number will certainly be damned. But he attributes these certain and opposite results solely to the actions of the creatures respectively.—He has in effect admitted the *certainty* that a definite number of mankind will *properly* use, and that the rest will as *certainly* abuse, their moral agency. The great question for solution now is, *Whence arises this latter certainty?* I have repeated this inquiry in various forms, in order that the subject may be strongly impressed upon the reader's mind. I ask again, How is it rendered certain that some men will properly exercise their agency? For if such exercise be *not* certain, *every thing pertaining to man's final destiny is a matter of chance!*

The mass of the Answer to the Question before us, only shows more clearly the inconsistency and falsehood of the doctrine of endless misery. It presents the Almighty in a very unfavorable and lamentable light. It supposes that he found himself under the *necessity* of choosing *one of two evils*, namely, either to create mankind subject or liable to endless wretchedness, with a positive knowledge that some would incur this doom; or not to create at all. I noticed this point in a previous Rejoinder, but may nevertheless be allowed to enlarge upon it in this place.

According to the respondent's views, the Almighty proposed to himself the creation of a race of rational beings.—He scanned the project with the eye of wisdom; and having viewed it in all its bearings, he clearly perceived that if he created such beings, he must give them a law having for the penalty of disobedience the dreadful horrors of interminable despair. He could perceive no other alternative than that of not creating any such race of beings!

Now it appears to me that the respondent is not so destitute of wisdom as his doctrine supposes the Almighty to have been. Can we not understand how God could have created a race of moral agents, without supposing those agents obnoxious to endless punishment? Is *endless hell-torment essential to the existence of moral agency?*

I solemnly aver, that I should feel condemned were I to suppose the Deity so destitute of goodness as to think of annexing endless misery to any law given for the government of man; or so devoid of wisdom as not to perceive, that he might create a race of moral agents and govern them as such, without the aid of a penalty which mercy could not approve, and the infliction of which would fill the habitations of the ransomed with lamentation and woe!

I will add in conclusion, that so soon as I can be directed to a law of God which has endless misery as a penalty annexed, I will acknowledge some plausibility in Fletcher's reasoning. Nay, I will go farther—I will clothe myself in sack cloth and ashes—I will bewail the prospective doom of the children of humanity—I will go mourning all my days and descend into the grave with the prayer in my heart, that in the resurrection God would pass over me with a silent

trump, nor rouse me from the sleep of death to behold the unutterable agony of any of my kindred of the human race!

175. Is not the merciful man always merciful to his beast?

A. Yes.

176. Will not the merciful God be always as merciful to His creatures, as the merciful man is to his beast?

A. Yes, infinitely more so, if they will receive it; but daily observation shows that thousands, do not and *will* not. What can be done with such ones?

Rej. "What can be done with such ones?" Why the respondent says they ought to be damned—but the Bible says, they shall be reconciled to God, made alive in Christ, become *new creatures*, etc. If the merciful God will *always* be infinitely more merciful to his creatures than the merciful man is to his beast, we need not be apprehensive of endless torment for even the most refractory of mankind. Would a merciful man doom a vicious horse or cross dog to an endless hell?

177. Is it true that the tender mercies of the Lord are over all his works? Psalm cxlv, 9.

A. Yes.

178. Is it true that the Almighty is 'without variableness, or the shadow of turning'?

A. Certainly.

179. Would there be any tender mercy in the infliction of endless misery?

A. No; but tender mercy had tried long before to no good purpose. See No. 2.

Rej. Then, according to the respondent's ideas, when God has tried the tender mercies of his love for a season, he will resort to "the tender mercies of the wicked," which are *cruel*! The respondent allows that there would be *no tender mercy* in the infliction of endless misery—consequently there would be *cruelty* therein! Is God cruel?

I desire the reader to remember this plain syllogism; the Lord is good to all; the Lord is unchangeable; therefore, the Lord will be unchangeably good to all, and his tender mercies will be eternally over all his works. In view of this conclusion, either the doctrine of endless misery must be discarded, or it must be shown that there would be tender mercy in the infliction of never ending torment!

180. Are the tender mercies of the Lord like unto the tender mercies of the wicked, which are cruel?

A. See Psalms I, 21.

Rej. The respondent has chosen a very summary way of evading this question. I do not suppose that God is altogether such an one as myself. I believe him to be infinitely more merciful than I am—yet I know that I would not allow the infliction of endless misery, if I could prevent it. If the respondent is disposed to keep silence when he is not willing to answer a plain Question, he may find something applicable to his case in Isa. xli, 28, 29.

181. If God is not the Father of Sinners, why do sinners pray, saying, "Our Father ——— forgive us our trespasses?"

A. The Scriptures, I believe never call God the Father of Sinners. As the Creator and Author of all things He is denominated, Num. xvi, 22, The Father of the Spirits of all flesh. See also Deut. xxxii, 6. Mal. ii, 10. But sinners are of their father the Devil: John viii, 44, and his work they do. "They are by nature children of wrath," and unless "They are born from above, they cannot see the Kingdom of Heaven;" but those who are *thus born* can cry, Abba, Father. It was the Disciples to whom our Lord said, When ye pray, say, "Our Father." But do not forget that God is a moral governor and must be obeyed.

182. 'Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?' Malachi ii, 10.

A. Yes, physically, as it respects the formation of our souls and bodies; but not morally, for in this respect, some are of the wicked one and some of God.

Rej. God created man in his own image, and in this character he sustains the relation of *Father* to all rational beings. "One God and Father of all," Eph. iv, 6. He

created the *beasts* of the field—but they are not his *children* any more than a house is the child of a carpenter. All rational beings are the offspring of God, whether they be or be not converted—but those only who are obedient to his commandments can properly be termed *characteristically* his children. The prodigal was the Son of his father, even while absent from the paternal roof. Obedience did not constitute the tie of relationship, and disobedience could not dissolve it. So in relation to our subject. God is our Father; mankind are his children. Our obedience to his law does not constitute him our Father, but in being obedient we are *characteristically* his children. Disobedience renders us in *character* the children of the Devil. In this sense Jesus said to the Jews, "Ye are of your father the Devil." He also called them "serpents, a generation of vipers"—but we do not thence infer that they were naturally the children of a snake. So neither were they naturally, but only in character and conduct, the children of evil dispositions—or if the word suits you better, of the Devil. This is equally true of all sinners—yet *sinners* are to pray, saying "Our Father forgive us our *trespasses*," or sins. This form of prayer was, indeed, given to the disciples—but if they were not *sinners*, in some degree the portion of the prayer referred to was not applicable to their case.

The truth is, we all have one Father, even God.—He is always characteristically our Father, though we are not always characteristically his children. To transgressors he is continually saying by the spirit of his love, "Turn unto me, O backsliding children, for I am married unto you." Jer. iii, 14.

183. If God be the Father of all men, will He do less for His children than earthly parents would do for theirs?

A. As our Creator and Redeemer He has done infinitely more, both to the just and unjust. As a Governor he must be obeyed.

Rej. Surely if God has done and, will do, infinitely more for mankind than earthly parents would do for their children if they possessed infinite power, we need harbor no apprehension of endless wo. The mother knows full well, that were she seated on the throne of judgment, she would not doom one of her children to endless pain, however disobedient he might have been. And will a God of infinite love pronounce a sentence to which that mother could not say "Amen?"

184. Is it true that God punishes us 'for our profit, that we might be partakers of His holiness?' Heb. xii, 11.

A. Yes, this is the end and design of all *disciplinary* punishment; but this does not always effect its object, for it does not "make all partakers of his holiness." Observe in the very nature of things there must be two kinds, or degrees, of punishment, *disciplinary* and *capital*. The framer of these questions appears to confound these. The former is designed principally for the good of the *sufferer*, and is never in proportion to the demerit of sin, the latter or capital, cannot be for the benefit of him on whom it is inflicted, for his moral condition is beyond cure, but it is for the benefit of *others*, that they may take warning by it; and is always in proportion to the amount of sin. All punishment at first is *disciplinary*; capital is never inflicted till the other entirely fails, and the moral condition of the sufferer becomes hopeless. Now *disciplinary* punishment upon a free agent might be continued to all eternity without effecting its object; for we see a far greater proportion of those who have been in our State Prison, go there again, than of those who have never been in it. Now one of two things must take place; this *disciplinary* course must be pursued for ever; or else, the capital or final must be inflicted; if the former, there could be no fixed government, for the wicked would become worse and worse, till the whole universe would become a scene of ruin, wretchedness, and anarchy; but if the latter be chosen, after having tried the former for millions of ages, a whole eternity would lie beyond the moment it was commenced. So that if the Universalist will allow, 1. That God exercises a moral gov-

vernment over rational intelligent creatures—2. That they are free moral agents, and 3. That they are immortal; I do not see how it is possible for him to disprove eternal punishment.

Rej. The respondent assumes many positions without the shadow of proof. 1st. He says, that "in the nature of things there must be two kinds, or degrees, of punishment; disciplinary and capital." 2d. He affirms that *disciplinary punishment* "is never in proportion to the demerit of sin."—3d. He asserts that the moral condition of some men is beyond cure. Not one of these positions is true.

But let us look at the supposed object of capital, that is, of endless punishment. The respondent says, it is inflicted "for the benefit of *others*, that they may take warning by it." But will endless punishment be for the benefit of the heavenly inhabitants? Will they take warning by it?

We are told that "disciplinary punishment upon a free agent might be continued to all eternity without effecting its object." But an *eternity* of disciplinary punishment is a contradiction in terms. *Disciplinary* punishment must result in the emendation of the sufferer.

I perceive that the respondent still holds to his Sadducean principles. He still proceeds on the assumption that no change is to be effected by the power of the resurrection. Hence, having satisfied himself that some of mankind *dis*impenitent, he draws the conclusion that they will eternally remain in an impenitent state. To all persons who hold this Sadducean idea, I beg leave to say, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God; for in the resurrection they are equal unto the Angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."—Let this plain truth be continually kept in remembrance, and we shall not be disposed to limit the mercy and redeeming love of the Almighty, either to the span of human life, or to a part of the human race.

The respondent states three positions, the admission of which by the Universalist would, in his judgment, render it impossible for us to disprove eternal punishment. Now however strangely it may sound in the respondent's ears, I use these very positions to establish the doctrine of Universalism. 1st. I affirm that God exercises a moral Government over mankind. They are his subjects, and he will govern them as he sees proper. 2d. They are moral agents, and as such are governed by that infinitely benevolent being whose "kingdom ruleth over all." 3d. Mankind, as the subjects and children of that benevolent being, are destined to an immortal existence—for it is written, "The creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Rom. viii.

In view of this glorious consummation of the moral government of the Deity, we allege, that not only is endless punishment disproved, but the final holiness and happiness of all mankind is clearly established.

185. Would endless punishment be for our profit?

A. No.

186. Would endless punishment 'yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them who are exercised thereby'?

A. No, but disciplinary *might* have done so. See on No. 184.

187. Is there an *afterward* to eternity? Heb. xii, 11.

188. Can any doctrine be *too good* to be true?

A. Truth is truth. In the last questions you appear to have misapprehended the Apostle's meaning: he is speaking in reference to *disciplinary*, and you about capital punishment. Truth seeks distinctions—error confounds all things.—You intimate that punishment must necessarily and uniformly better the moral condition of those who endure it. Now a matter of fact lies wholly against you. It does not even generally produce this affect. Thousands, under the mildest, or wisest course of chastisement, wax worse and worse, till their moral feelings are blunted, their conscience seared, and they become impenetrable to all good. How would you cure such? Or how could they be cured?

Rej. I think I have not misapprehended the Apostle's meaning. He informs us that "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," and the respondent has several times admitted that God loves even his enemies. Paul informs us, moreover, that "ALL are partakers" of chastisement. He then

compares the object of earthly parents, (who for a few days chasten their children after their own pleasure,) with the purpose of "the Father of Spirits," who chastens us "for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness."—And he adds, "Now no chastening, [of any kind or character,] for the present seemeth to be joyous but grievous, nevertheless afterward, [and this is the only consideration that can justify punishment,] it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them who are exercised thereby."—One thing is certain—this language cannot have endless punishment in view; and another thing is equally certain—no man can refer to any law of God which has the penalty of endless punishment annexed. Paul knew of no doctrine in opposition to the final reconciliation of all things. He testifies that "God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth," and that "he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

But the respondent alleges, that "punishment does not uniformly, nor even generally, better the moral condition of those who endure it." I freely grant that we do not, in all cases, clearly perceive the beneficial tendency of punishment in all its bearings—but we have so much confidence in the benevolence and wisdom of God, as to believe that "tho' he causes grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies; for he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men." Lam. iii, 32, 33.—Neither the Bible nor reason will allow us to assume, that God inflicts a single stripe in vain, or not for valuable ends. It is written, "If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes; nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail." Ps. lxxxix, 30—33. But the respondent says, God will utterly take his loving-kindness from a part of his creatures! And why? Because he will eventually find that some of them cannot be cured of their moral malady!! Now it appears to me, that this is limiting the Holy One of Israel—setting bounds to infinite love, and limits to Almighty power. If Saul, who was the chief of sinners, was converted from the error of his ways in a moment, why should we suppose that the same redeeming energy would be less efficacious in any conceivable case? The truth is, no man can be so bad as to be "impenetrable to all good;" and I doubt not that the withdrawal of the veil of eternity will so display the loveliness of our Father in heaven, that every heart will irresistibly adore him, and every mouth be filled with his praise!

The respondent has given no Answer to Q. 188. He clearly saw it would not do to say, that a doctrine can be too good to be true—and to allow that a doctrine cannot be too good to be true, would be to acknowledge something very like Universalism.

OF THE LOVE WHICH GOD HAS FOR US.

I have loved thee with an everlasting love.

Jer. xxxi. 3.

God has not waited for us to love him; before all time, before we were endowed with life, he thought of us, and thought of doing us good.—What he intended in eternity, he has performed in time. His hand has bestowed every variety of blessings upon us; neither our unfaithfulness nor ingratitude has dried up the fountain of his goodness to us, or arrested the stream of his bounty.

Oh thou Eternal Love, thou hast loved me when I could neither know nor acknowledge thee; immeasurable love! thou hast made me what I am, thou hast given me all that I possess, and thou hast yet promised me infinitely more! Oh love, without interruption, without change, that all the bitter waters of my iniquities could not extinguish! Have I any heart, oh my God, if I am not penetrated with gratitude and love for thee!—*Fenelon.*

FILIAL AFFECTION.

The filial affection of Dr. Warburton was very striking. 'When I complimented my friend,' says Bishop Hurd, in his life of Warburton, 'on his promotion to the See of Gloucester, it comes, said he, too late; if my mother had been living, it might have given me some satisfaction!'

Previous to her death he expressed himself thus in a letter to a friend. "No mortal can ever merit more of me than she has done.—Her decline of life possesses me with anxiety; and I have no support for this but in the thoughts of that last meeting which excludes all farther chance of separation."

By the last Trumpet we learn that a Mr. Charles E. Hewes, of Danville, Vt. has commenced preaching the doctrine of Universal Salvation.

The bundle noticed by Br. S. W. W. of Providence, awhile since, has not been received.

Original.

AN EXPLANATION.

"OBJECTION.—As the same causes produce the same effects, the Rainbow must have existed before the flood."

ANSWER.—So it may, but not as a sign of the Covenant. The Hebrew word, which in Gen. ix, 13, is rendered *set*, ought to be rendered *appoint*; in which case the passage would run thus:—I do appoint my bow in the cloud to be a sign or token of the covenant between me and the earth.—*Horne.*

As an addendum to the above, I would remark that our Saviour on a certain occasion pointed to the sun and the rain as the signs or tokens of God's love and impartiality to man.—He appointed these things to be considered evidences of our heavenly Father's universal and unchangeable goodness. Now the sun and the rain were visible to mortal sight, as well before, as after, Jesus had instructed men to look upon them as the sure indications of God's immutable and impartial benevolence. But they were never before viewed in this light. Hence Christ appointed them to be thus looked upon.

A. M.

Reading, Pa.

Original.

A LETTER

To the Rev. Z. Whitmore, of North-Guilford, Ct.

Dear Sir—A short time since I was favoured with an opportunity of listening to a discourse delivered by you at the Presbyterian Church in Guilford, wherein you designed to disprove the doctrine of the final reconciliation of all things to God, and to establish the idea that the all-wise Creator will consign a portion of the most noble work of his own hands to everlasting and everlasting despair, which no doubt in the opinion of many of your hearers was carried beyond the power of refutation. But in my estimation you fell far short of your aim. I think by a careful examination of your arguments you will find them to be based altogether upon your own assumption. The time has been when few even dared to call in question any declaration of a minister of the gospel; but times have changed, and people begin to require something more than mere assertion upon which to ground their faith. Believing as I do that you are in an error, and inculcating false and erroneous principles in the understanding of your hearers, grant me, Sir, the privilege of suggesting to your mind a few ideas respecting your sermon, which I shall endeavor to do in candor, and in friendship.

For the foundation of your discourse, you selected 2d Thess. 1st chapter, 9th verse—"who shall be punished with everlasting destruction," &c. In commencement you say, "whether my present discourse will do any good I know not, but this I do know, the preaching of endless punishment has done good; it has induced many to flee from the wrath to come." Now, Sir, not disputing your assertion, for assertion it was, suffer me to inquire (even admitting the wrath spoken of to be what you represented,) how any one can be benefitted by the preaching of such

doctrine. The case of Judas is to the point. When speaking of him you tell us that he, without doubt, must be eternally miserable. I ask your reasons for thus believing. I contend that never was repentance more prompt nor more sincere than the repentance of Judas Iscariot.—While all others had forsaken their master and fled, he alone entered the judgment hall, returned his ill-gotten gains, and asserted the innocence of his Lord. He made all reparation in his power, and according to best conclusions, fell victim to the anguish of a broken heart. But, say you, his repentance was produced through fear of consequences—his motive was not correct—he was actuated by selfish principles—it was not the love of the Saviour which occasioned his tears of bitterness, consequently he could not be benefitted thereby. Now if your reasoning is good in one case, it must hold equally good in the other. Like causes always produce like effects. If repentance produced through fear could not benefit Judas, then it cannot benefit any one at the present time, and of course, it can do no good to preach the doctrine in question.

Again, you say, "in order to win souls to Christ, this doctrine must be clearly taught."—You, Sir, will not contend that the doctrine of endless misery is clearly taught in the Old Testament. You know it is not. Here then is a Physician, living in the midst of a destructive disease, multitudes are daily swept away on all sides by the malady; he has in his possession an excellent remedy; indeed he knows it to be the only cure, and yet for 4000 years says nothing about it, but keeps it a profound secret!—The conclusion is inevitable, that he is the murderer of those individuals. Paul says he shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God, and yet he never mentioned hell in his life. I ask, and I urge the question, what reason can you assign for such neglect, if your doctrine be true. You affirm that the persons spoken of in the text, are all such as die impenitent. For this, however, we had your bare assertion without a shadow of proof. I feel bound to believe any position that can be clearly sustained from the Bible; but in my opinion you will find it somewhat difficult to prove that your text has any allusion to those who die impenitent. If you will be to the trouble of a close investigation of the subject, you will find, as I think, that the persons spoken of were the persecutors of the Christians at Thessalonica. You also asserted, or at least conveyed the idea, that this was to take place at the end of the material world. This also I consider a mistake. By consulting the 7th and 8th verses of the chapter from which your text is taken, you will perceive that their punishment was to be at the same time that they who were troubled should obtain rest; and it would be absurd to suppose that the persecuted Christians, to whom this epistle was addressed, are not to find rest until this world shall be brought to a close. The time I consider as passed, and am confident that I have abundant scripture testimony to justify me in thus believing.

Again, you say, "I take it for granted that there is a punishment after death; and the opposite is too notoriously inconsistent with reason and scripture to require any proof." Now, really, it is somewhat surprising that you should suffer the most constituent principle of your discourse to rest entirely upon assumption, especially when within your reach, as you seemed to imagine, lay such an abundance of testimony. The very point which should have been supported by the most clear and unequivocal evidences, you even placed yourself under the responsibility of taking for granted. It is an easy matter to assume any position, but let me tell you, sir, the doctrine of endless torments can never be shown to be true. It may be supposed, but it can never be proved.

Your remarks upon the word everlasting are

worthy of notice. You say this is limited only when used in a limited sense, and must be understood according to the nature of things to which it is applied. Here, then, it should have been your object to have shown to your audience, that punishment in its nature is endless, but on the contrary it was only taken for granted. The language of Moses is this, "that as a father chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee." I presume you will admit that a father chastens his child with an intention to correct, to reform, to make better. "No chastisement," says the apostle, "for the present seemeth joyous, but grievous, nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them who are exercised thereby." Certainly there can be no *afterward* to endless punishment, and never have I as yet been able to learn what good can result therefrom. As you profess to have been taught by the Holy Spirit, will you confer on me the favour of an explanation of the subject.

Again "when Christ used the same word in regard to the eternal happiness of the righteous, in the same breath," you ask, "is it not probable, yea certain, that it signifies an eternal duration." I answer, it remains to be *proved* that it implies an unlimited duration in either case. You did not show even that it refers to a future state, I regret, sir, that your discourse was founded so much upon assertion, and supposition, and your arguments left so at loose ends.

The Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, you affirm, can never be forgiven. The plain language of scripture is evidently this, "come now and let us reason together; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool;" "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin," &c., and yet you expressly taught that there is one species of sin for which the most bitter repentance is useless, and which the blood of the Son of God cannot wash away. Either you must give up this passage as a support of your doctrine, or that the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." I can do no better than refer you to Dr. A. Clark upon this subject, and if you disagree with him, will you please have the goodness to inform me wherein he is incorrect.

The parable of tares you adduced as a proof of your doctrine, but you did not attempt to show that this refers to the immortal state of man, you relied wholly upon the credulity of your hearers, supposing that they would take whatever you said for granted. The phrase end of the world in the New Testament always without exception refers to the end of the Mosaic dispensation.---The commencement of a new dispensation, or display of God's judgments, and the conclusion of the old, is the subject treated of in this parable. Thus the Saviour says the harvest is the end of the world.

The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, you consider positive proof of the doctrine of ceaseless torments. Here let me ask one simple question. Even admitting the doctrine you preach to be true, is it not very mysterious that it should never be spoken of except in parables and dark figurative expressions? Had I truth to communicate to a friend of as serious importance as the one now under consideration, I am confident that I should inform him in plain terms—in language that could not be misunderstood. But upon your exposition of the parable, I wish to know what the Rich Man has done that he so justly merits the eternal vengeance of God. I take the position that he was a perfectly righteous man; that he never violated the law of God. Prove to me that from the day of his birth to the day of his death, he was ever guilty of a single crime, and I give you the argument. On the other hand, what has Lazarus done that he is received into Abraham's bosom. Lazarus was a poor beggar, and he came to poverty by his intemperance and

gluttony, for Solomon says "the glutton and drunkard shall come to poverty." David says, "I have been young and now I am old, yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken nor his seed begging bread." Did not Lazarus beg bread? Our Saviour says, "take no thought what ye shall eat, &c., but seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." I say again that he was the vilest wretch that ever existed in the universe, and I call upon you to disprove it. If you still insist upon your explanation of this parable, I shall insist that the more wicked and rebellious a man conducts himself in this life, the better will be his condition hereafter. As I understand this parable, it is intended to represent the condition of the Jew and Gentile nations, and in this opinion I am supported by a number of orthodox commentators. Dr. Gill, a strong believer in endless misery, says he understands by the Rich Man the Jews in general, and by the beggar our Lord Jesus Christ himself. For further particulars see Dr. Gill's commentary.

Again, you say, "the very idea that there is to be a general judgment, proves that there will be an eternal separation." This is taking one position for granted, and using it as positive proof of a second, which stands upon the same foundation. I think it should have been your first object to show that there is yet a future general judgment. When this was clearly established, your remarks might have come in with some force.

In one part of your discourse, you informed your audience that the subjects of punishment in a future state would be deprived of all tender feelings; that in them no natural affection would exist; that hatred would be the inhabitant of every soul. In another part you roundly contradict this position, and affirm that they will mourn and lament to see those who have been brought there through their means; this will increase their misery. This, truly, is strange logic—that a person dispossessed of all *sympathy*, should weep and mourn for another's afflictions. The saints in heaven you represented as being filled with acclamations of joy, praising and glorifying God for creating intelligent beings, and for one false step has thrust them down the deep ocean of eternal despair. Are these the feelings which the redeemed in heaven are to possess? Am I, by being changed from a state of sin and corruption to that of perfect holiness and purity, to become a hardened wretch that I can rejoice at the misery of others? Then may this change never be mine. Let me go where I can share the sympathy of my fellows; where I can weep with those that weep; where those feelings of tenderness which enable me to feel another's woe, will never be taken from me. Justice in eternity will have taken the place of mercy, and all attempts to gain God's favor will prove fruitless. You seemed to speak of justice and mercy as opposite attributes in the Deity. Grant this, and we prove God to be divided against himself. But this cannot be the case. Justice is *not* opposed to mercy, nor is mercy opposed to justice, what one demands, the other sanctions. In proof of your assertion you quoted the 24th, 25th, and 26th verses of the 1st chapter of Proverbs, "because I had call'd, and ye refused," &c. This is a most shocking, and I am inclined to think wilful perversion of the sacred volume. You, Sir, would put this language into the mouth of Jehovah, and represent him as laughing at the calamity of those miserable wretches whose misfortune it was to become the unhappy subjects of his unceasing wrath, and mock in return when they cry for mercy.

My dear Sir, is this the opinion you entertain of Him you worship? Can it be possible that you imagine your heavenly Father will thus rejoice in the unending misery of his own children? At such conduct would the wild and

barbarous savage be ashamed, and to suppose this is the case would be giving the eternal Jehovah the blackest character possible. It would be bringing the glory of the incorruptible God down to a level, nay, beneath the brute creation. I beg you to examine those passages with their connections. By a perusal of the 20th verse you will perceive it is the voice of wisdom, instead of the Almighty, "wisdom crieth without, she uttereth her voice in the street," &c.

In addressing the throne of grace, you told your heavenly Father that you had sinned against light and knowledge, and it would have been just in him had he long ago cut you off and sent you to perdition. Now, truly, I do not wonder you felt that you had sinned against light and knowledge, in the application of these passages, but I do not think you ever committed sin enough to make it just in God to damn you to all eternity. Your conscience if it is not seared as with an hot iron must have inflicted an adequate punishment. But once more, "he that knoweth his master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knoweth it not, and doth commit things worthy of stripes shall be beaten with few stripes. Now if poor Universalists, whom you consider to be in darkness, are to be punished with endless misery for sinning ignorantly, what, I would ask, must be the punishment of those who sin against light and knowledge?

Again, you remark, "they will sink deeper and deeper, so that their first suffering will seem a heaven to that which they will eventually suffer, and thus their misery will increase throughout eternity." While you were uttering this sentence, I placed my eyes upon you, and was involuntarily led to ask whether you truly felt its force. Allowing me to judge from appearances, you did not, you certainly could not. To have a realizing sense of the representation you gave of the future state, would strike horror to the feelings of the most hardened and debased wretch that ever existed in the universe of God. Is it possible that you could have looked down upon your audience with such seeming coldness and indifference, had you felt the truth of your remarks? Surely you could not, so long as one spark of sympathy remained within your breast.

But let me bring the case nearer to you, can you look upon your nearest friends and relations, your tender wife, and affectionate little ones, whose well-being is tenderly interwoven with your own, truly believing that they in the all-wise purposes of the Most High, are to endure the suffering you described, and in deep sincerity say, "Lord thy will be done." Much as the cruel doctrine you inculcate may have taken possession of your affections, *you could not do it!* The tender feelings of your heart, in spite of every effort would exclaim, *not so.*—I beseech you, therefore, in the language of the Apostle, "be ye reconciled to God." In thus far briefly noticing your discourse, I have endeavoured to avoid misrepresentation; but if in any instance I have done so, you will greatly oblige me by correcting the same. Let me now entreat you to consider this subject with all the candour you possess, and see whether you preach the gospel of Christ, which is glad tidings of great joy to all people, or whether you preach a doctrine which spreads misery, insanity and suicide, wherever it is diffused. Much pleasure would it afford me, could I be instrumental in disclosing to you the doctrine of Universal grace, so plainly taught in the Bible, and see you delivered from that fear of death which all your lifetime subjects you to bondage, clothing your countenance in gloom, and brought to the happy enjoyment of that peace which "passeth all understanding." With sentiments of friendship,

I am yours, &c.

LUTHER PARMALEE.
Guilford, June 4th, 1834.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1834.

The "Young Men's Universalist Institute" meet every Thursday evening at 8 o'clock, in a hall situated at the N. E. corner of the first alley in 8th street, below Walnut, Philadelphia. Entrance from the alley.

'AN INTERESTING SCENE.'

We find in the Christian Intelligencer, of New-York, a very fine article under this attractive caption, and as it pleased ourselves and led us to profitable meditation, we doubt not a notice of it will interest our readers also.

It appears that on Sunday, June 15, between the services of the sanctuary, "Sabbath School diplomas were conferred on fourteen of the youth belonging to the Sabbath School, connected with the Middle Dutch Church. These scholars," says the editor of the Intelligencer, "were distinguished for their proficiency in the study of the Catechisms of the Church. Several of them had committed to memory the whole of four Catechisms with proofs, and also large portions of the New Testament." Dr. BROWNLEE was present of course, and "delivered" we are told "a highly interesting and most impressive address." Of this we can give only brief extracts. "He presented the fact that the gospel, with all its precious promises, is addressed especially to the young." "The scenes of the great day were presented before them, and referring to 1 Cor. xv, he dwelt on the manner of the resurrection of the righteous and of the wicked, the one in glory, the other in dishonor, the one to everlasting misery, the other to dwell with God in heaven. Dr. B. then briefly showed how they could obtain eternal life." . . . "Jesus is the physician of souls. Children especially should attend to these things. They must, and he referred to the consideration that probably more children had reached heaven than grown up persons. You, said the Doctor, must try to go there—the Savior came to call little children. Study your bible, go to the Lord Jesus, he will receive you, he promised his blessing to children. The means he explained, are connected with the end. The seed must be sown, and being covered up in the ground, it springs up and produces fruit."

This of course is but a very imperfect view of the address. The whole article on the subject, however, led us to the following reflections:

1. What an important place the Catechisms hold in the breasts of our Dutch friends. They are even preferred to the word of God! Sunday school scholars are entitled to Diplomas who are 'distinguished for their proficiency in the study of the Catechisms of the Church.' It is thought proper to publish the fact that some of those scholars "had committed to memory the whole of four Catechisms," while no information is deemed necessary in relation to the portion of the inspired word thus committed. Our Dutch friends may regard this as a subject of glorying, and so they seem to do, but we beg them to remember, that there have been those before, whose "glory is their shame." The BIBLE is the religion of Protestants. This is the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice.

2. We could not but ask ourselves the question, Where does Dr. BROWNLEE find "the fact that the gospel with all its precious promises, is addressed especially to the young?" Christ's commission to his apostles was, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Of himself he said, "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Were the young especially lost? Again, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Are the young especially sinners?

3. What could Dr. BROWNLEE mean by referring to 1 Cor. xv, and dwelling on the manner of the resurrection of the righteous and of the wicked? Perhaps there may be a mistake on the part of the editor of the Intelligencer, if not, Dr. Brownlee must have unluckily misrepresented the apostle in the grossest manner. St. Paul says nothing in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, nor elsewhere, of any resurrection of the dead "in dishonor," or "to everlasting misery." He asserted, ver. 22, that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," and in ver. 26, that "death the last enemy shall be destroyed." At ver. 36, he commenced a reply to this question, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" Dr. BROWNLEE tells the Sabbath School children that the righteous are raised "in glory," and "to dwell with God in heaven," but the wicked are raised "in dishonor," and "to everlasting mis-

ery." In this the learned Doctor overstepped the word of God. Paul after having adduced several analogies which would serve to illustrate his reply to the above question, says, ver. 42, "So also is the resurrection of the dead: it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." What could have tempted Dr. BROWNLEE thus to ascribe an idea to Paul, which the apostle never expressed, and to have perverted his language in this palpable and graceless manner, we are utterly at a loss to imagine. The apostle speaks of but one manner of resurrection—that is, in *incorruption, in glory, in power, and a spiritual body*. He does not say that the wicked are to be raised in dishonor, or "to everlasting misery." This is an assertion of Dr. Brownlee, and one which every intelligent person who ever read the chapter referred to must have known to be entirely opposed to the apostle's argument and language, or at least, without one shadow of support therefrom. It is a shameless perversion of the word of God! But we leave it to the Doctor's conscience to settle with Him, who owns, and defends the oracles of Truth.

4. Unsatisfied with the prospective "scenes of the great day," the Doctor undertook to show the Sabbath School children "how they could obtain eternal life." To a professed Calvinist this must be rather a laborious task, we think. And such is Dr. Brownlee. He believes that God "in his eternal and unchangeable counsel of mere goodness, has elected in Christ Jesus" some to eternal life, "without any respect to their works," and left the rest "in the fall and perdition wherein they have involved themselves." Now the elect cannot fail of eternal life, while the non-elect can no more obtain it than they could hurl Jehovah from his throne. Yet we are gravely told that, "Dr. B. then briefly showed how they could obtain eternal life," that is, if the Doctor believes his own creed, he showed how the elect could obtain what they could not lose, and the non-elect how they could obtain what God's irreversible decree had from eternity denied them!

5. The Doctor "referred to the consideration that probably more children had reached heaven than grown up persons." We feel a little anxious here to learn the grounds upon which Dr. Brownlee predicates this probability. By turning to his creed we are informed that God from eternity elected some to dwell with himself in heaven, and passed by or reprobated the rest; and furthermore, that this was done "without any respect to their works." Now we are at a loss to see how, on this impartial principle, "more children have probably reached heaven than grown up persons." Our arithmetic would not furnish such a conclusion. Assuming the Arminian plan, Dr. Brownlee's hypothesis is probably true. But for a Calvinist to throw out such an observation is little less than denying his creed.

6. The Doctor told the children that "Those that preach error, would murder your souls." This is charitable indeed and admirably calculated to beget within them a common respect for Christian ministers of other denominations.

In conclusion we should say that the scene described by our brother of the Intelligencer must have been "interesting" indeed. To see the Catechism preferred to the Bible, and a Calvinistic minister not only perverting the Scriptures but preaching rank Arminianism must, at any time and under any circumstances, be sufficient to excite interest. We do not wonder, therefore, that our brother says "every hearer was deeply affected." The scene was enough to make angels weep.

PUT THIS AND THAT TOGETHER.

The Lutheran Clergyman, once more.

Does the reader remember an article in our 19th No. from the "Episcopal Recorder," of a Lutheran Clergyman who completely astounded a Universalist Minister, by requesting him to "read the next verse?" as also, the letter from Br. Myers, (in the same No.) in relation to it; and the story also related of Dr. Beecher by Br. Whittemore in allusion to the same thing, published in No. 25 under the head "Dilemma;" and then again the unfortunate efforts of Rev. Mr. Porter, in Danvers, Mass. to produce a laugh on the strength of this "Lutheran story," but who, like many a worthier man, fell in the ditch of his own digging, which account was also published in No. 28 of the present volume? If the reader does remember all this, or will turn to those Nos. he will be fully prepared to relish the subjoined communication from Br. Myers; a kind of second part to the orthodox tune; rather a discordant one we admit. Which of them, however, is the nearest in tune, we are per-

fectly willing to leave to the decision of the candid reader, after a thorough examination of the whole matter. We are half inclined to think Mr. Ernst had better not carry his part any farther. Br. Myers has probably too much compass of voice for him. Br. M. deserves credit for following up so closely this business, and we thank him for the statement furnished. Will the Episcopal Recorder insert his article that its readers may know "the conclusion of the whole matter?" P.

Petersburg, Lancaster Co. Pa. June 21, 1834.

Br. PRICE—I have been to the town of L—, Pa. again, to see the famous Lutheran clergyman, who, as report says, stopped the mouth of a certain Universalist Preacher some years since, and that no Preacher of our order had preached there since; a statement of which is already before the public. As it is not likely that our opponents will publish any thing about my visit this time, it therefore devolves upon some one else to do it, and as no one can be supposed to give any better statement than myself, I am induced to present you the following, which you will please to lay before the readers of your valuable paper, the "Messenger and Universalist."

Universalism in Lebanon, Pa.

I paid a visit to this place on the 3d inst. and endeavored to obtain a house to preach in that evening, but failed in my object. The Commissioner residing in the place not being at home, the Court House could not be obtained in his absence, and I believe not even in his presence. The Academy in the place is under the control of a rank Presbyterian, and therefore out of the reach of a heretic. Nothing being now left but the Churches and Market House, I directed my steps to the house of Rev. Mr. Ernst, the Lutheran clergyman, who, as was said, stopped my mouth before. I knocked at the door, was asked to walk in, and found the Rev. gentleman at home. I introduced myself as the Universalist who had preached in their Court House some years since and asked him if he recollected what had then passed. He said he did. I then told him how I was situated, what had been reported in the different prints, that I much desired to preach in their place once more, that it appeared impossible to get a house, and politely asked him for the use of his Church that evening. He said that he had not the control or power to grant my request, that the members of his church alone had that power. I then told him to give me a list of them, together with a few lines from his hand to them, and I had no doubt but they would grant my request. This he refused to do, saying that it would not do, and that the doctrine would not take there. I answered, that if he thought the doctrine would not take, there would be no risk in granting its advocates a hearing, when they also were willing to have all the objections which could be raised against it produced on the spot; that if they would let me have their Church, he might sit in the desk with me, and I would give him liberty to object to any thing that I might advance which he did not consider the doctrine of the Bible, and thus put the subject to rest forever. He laughed, shook his head, and again said it would not do. I stayed with him for three hours, during which time we kept talking as fast as possible, sometimes both a time.

Mr. Ernst is a very pleasant man, and our conversation was all in good humour, and therefore very agreeable. In our conversation he brought forth nothing new, but things old, which have been refuted times without number; and as he frequently burst out in a hearty laugh, I judged him not so far from the kingdom of heaven as to be out of the reach of hope, (for who could believe the doctrine of endless misery and laugh?) Having this opinion of him, I endeavored to get out his candid views on the subject of the final destiny of the human family, but my endeavors were all in vain.—He said several times that he would not say that the doctrine of the restitution of all things unto God was true, neither would he say that it was not true, that he had not made up his mind on the subject!!! (A teacher, and not made up his mind on the system of his teaching!) I finally, after three hours talk, left his house. When about going, he asked me whether I would preach there that evening. I told him I should, provided I could get a place, and if I did, I would let him know.

When all hope of getting a house, excepting the public Market Place, was given up, I resolved upon holding a meeting in that, at 7 o'clock that evening. I asked for the use of it, which was granted very willingly. I made my object known, and sent also

a notice to Rev. Mr. Ernst. The hour appointed came, I took some Pamphlets, and my Testament and Hymn Book under my arm, and repaired to the place of meeting. On my way going there I passed Mr. Ernst standing on the pavement talking with somebody. I saluted him. He asked me whether I would commence soon. I answered that the appointed hour had arrived, and whenever an assembly of six should have collected, I should begin, and asked him whether he would not walk along and make the introductory prayer. He shook his head and said it would not do. I passed on, saw groups of people standing and talking at different places, (I supposed about me.) When I arrived, I found the place vacant, not a soul there! I took my seat on a box, (which I afterwards used as a desk,) laid down my Pamphlets, and waited for customers to purchase my marketing, or rather to take them as a gift, for I gave them without money and without price. I looked up my hymns and text—the people began to collect, one by one at first, and when a small congregation had assembled, I opened by singing and prayer, and took my text, Mark xvi. from verse 15 to the end of the chapter. I first made some preliminary remarks, stating the reason why I stood there in that unusual place, and gave them a statement of all that had passed when I had preached there before, and how the report had gone the rounds in print, that a Lutheran minister had put me down. &c. &c. That I had come back to not only 'read out my text,' but also, to *preach it out*—that I had been to this Lutheran minister's house and asked him for the use of his church, but was refused, and therefore was compelled to stand thus before them. I then went on and explained my text from end to end, and by the time I had got through, there were about two hundred persons present, who were very attentive and appeared well satisfied with the exercises, which were in the German language.

I was told that Rev. Mr. Ernst was in a house on the opposite side of the street, directly behind me, having had the window raised up and hearing the whole discourse. I distributed my pamphlets after the close of the services and walked back to the place of my lodgings, well pleased. What effect it will have time alone must prove, but I judge that it will be a good one. There appeared to have been a moving of the waters, and no doubt some cures will be performed. I shall call that way again at some future time, to water the young plants. I went from Lebanon to Jonestown and Millerstown, in the same county, and preached at both these places to well satisfied congregations, and returned home thro' Lebanon again, where I was asked when I would come again, and informed by others that they were sorry they could not attend my services, being absent at the time; (not bad signs surely.)

JACOB MYERS.

FUNERAL HONORS TO LA FAYETTE.

Though it has not been our custom to notice passing events, save those of a more immediate religious character, yet we doubt not we shall be indulged in a brief allusion to the one announced at the head of this article. It is unnecessary for us to particularize in relation to the time, or circumstances, of the death of La Fayette. These have all reached our readers, ere this, through the appropriate channel of the secular journals. We more especially desire to record, to the credit and glory of our country, the spontaneous and universal demonstration of sympathy and sorrow exhibited in this vast community, on Thursday of last week, during the funeral ceremonies of this great and illustrious man.

At an early hour in the afternoon, business seemingly by one common consent was suspended; at least in the vicinity of the route designated for the procession; and immense numbers of citizens congregated in the streets, about windows, and on the tops of houses, throughout its whole range, anxiously waiting in their respective positions, the approach of the grand spectacle. From our office we had a fine view of it, and some faint idea may be formed of its extent, when we say, that from the time it first came in sight, till we perceived the rear, was about one hour and twenty minutes! It was judged to have reached at least three miles.

The length of the procession, its slow and measured tread, the appearance of the military with their shrouded banners & arms reversed, the shrill and melancholy strains of the death march, with the surrounding crowds of people, altogether, presented one of the most mournful spectacles we ever beheld. If these were genuine indications of a sorrowing people, then, in truth, had a great man fallen! And we could not but reflect that if the spirit of the departed hero was per-

mitted to hover over the scene, it must have approved, in its purity, every former effort "to be great," while there was such evidence "of goodness, in its greatness;" for no man can be followed to the grave with such an universal expression of sympathy, without being good. Well may New-York be proud of the events of that day in the annals of her history. And, to the honor of our country, it demonstrates most clearly, that whatever else she may be charged with, the sin of ingratitude cannot be laid at her door. Long may she stand out among the nations of the earth, distinguished in this manner for her manifestations of gratitude to the great and the good. She presented no pageant, called forth at the tyrant's nod, but one universal burst of feeling, from hearts that are free! We love our country!

P.

LONGRIDGE, CONN.

We are especially gratified in being enabled to give the evidence of the prosperity of our cause in this place contained in the following note from Br. Hillyer. It is but about one year since the Society was organized there, and they will now very soon have completed one of the most tasteful edifices to be found any where in that region. The location itself is delightful. Longridge is situated 7 or 8 miles north of the town of Stamford, near the N. York line, on quite an eminence, from whence you have a fine view of Long-Island Sound, and an extensive prospect of the surrounding country. We almost envy our friends there the enjoyment within their reach. Sitting as they may soon do, within their own beautiful temple, dedicated to the worship of the only living and true God—the Father of the Spirits of all flesh, they can listen to the multiplied evidences of the goodness of their Father in heaven, as drawn from the rich volume of inspiration, with none to molest or make them afraid. And then they may step out to a view of the wide spread volume of nature before them, and read in language as clear and explicit as the sun beam, the same cheering and consoling doctrine, that God is indeed "good to all, and that his tender mercies are over all the work of his hand." Oh, let us exhort them not to prove unmindful of their manifold blessings.

The house stands in Connecticut, but many of the congregation and society reside within the limits of New-York. We would not by any means flatter our respected Br. Hillyer, who labors in the society one fourth of the time. But we may be allowed to say, that this house is situated about 3 miles from Stanwich, the place where Br. H. and Mr. Payne held their discussion in January last, and where the Congregationalist meeting house was closed against them after three days debate. From the commendable zeal manifested by the Society, and the rapid progress they have made, the reader can readily infer how much the cause has suffered in that section from the debate in question. Well may Mr. Payne be backward in resuming it again, though he stands publicly pledged to do it!

P.

Br. PRICE.—It may gratify some of your readers to learn that our friends in Longridge are rapidly progressing with their Church. It is their design to have it ready for occupation as soon as possible. It was raised the 12th of June, when, as it was judged, there were near three hundred people present. And here it is with pleasure that I am enabled to add, they performed their labor in raising without the aid of ardent spirits. No accident occurred. The house is after the Grecian order. Our brethren intend that it shall equal in neatness any edifice within thirty miles of its location. Under the superintendence of its enterprising builders, (the Messrs. Marshall's,) I doubt not that their expectations will be fully realized.

S. J. HILLYER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We take the liberty of making the following extract from a private communication recently received from Monroe County, N. Y. under date of June 21st. The writer will accept our thanks for his remembrance of us, and the interest expressed in behalf of the Messenger. We are especially pleased with one portion of his communication—a determination to increased zeal in spreading a knowledge of that truth which maketh free indeed. How many there are, with the best intentions, no doubt, who, if they should but take a serious retrospect of the past, would have much to regret on the score of inactivity, and be equally "surprized" with our correspondent, at their want of zeal, when circumstances so much demanded exertion. Are there any such glancing over this article? Let them reflect that it is never too late to do good.

We thankfully accept the writer's propositions. The papers will be mailed as he directs. The "Controversy," or the "Answers and Rejoinders," to which he refers, are neither published in pamphlet form. They are both now in progress through the columns of the Messenger, as he will perceive. We can send the papers from the commencement of either, or both, if they desire it. They can inform us through their Post-Masters.

Mr. PRICE.—I think I promised when I last saw you, that I would again become a subscriber to your valuable periodical, when permanently settled, after my removal from Dutchess County. Notwithstanding I have been anxious to fulfil my promise before this, I should probably have postponed it still longer, had not my attention been called more immediately to the subject, by the measures or endeavours of our Limitarian brethren in this vicinity, to *darken* instead of *enlighten* the minds of the people.—How unscriptural the means resorted to! How unjust thus to blind the minds of those who are obliged in a measure, (not having sufficient time to read, examine and judge for themselves,) to put confidence in their assertions; or can it be possible they are so ignorant of the subject they pretend to teach? It rather strikes me that this latter is the case. Then, indeed, the "blind do lead the blind," and they must shortly fall into the ditch together. Alas! when will men learn to think of Deity as they ought.

The more I think upon this subject, the more I am convinced of the necessity of the most strenuous exertion of every philanthropist. It is the cause of Heaven itself; and can we thus sit in a state of morbid insensibility, indifferent as it were to the misery or happiness of our fellow men? I am surprised, when I reflect back upon the past, and see how dilatory I have been. But time, I hope, will enable me to make amends. I have just received a letter from a friend in Dutchess, who states that the cause is silently, but permanently advancing, in that section.—My heart bids it God speed.

But I commenced this letter for the purpose of renewing my subscription to the "Messenger," which you will please forward to me. I have also obtained two other subscribers, to whom you will address the Messenger as below. The circle of my acquaintance is as yet limited in this neighbourhood. Though I hope to extend it so far as to make an addition to this list, by the commencement of your next volume.

L. B. C.

We venture an extract also from another letter just received from a friend in Ulster county. This writer, we hardly think, can be accused of lukewarmness—at least we should not so accuse him, for he has furnished us in all, on the present Vol. of the Messenger, a list of seventeen subscribers from his own immediate vicinity. Brethren, how many such friends should we need to place us beyond the reach of the Type Founder's and Paper Maker's dun? or the harassing call of un-paid workmen?

We have reason to rejoice if the paper, as he intimates, has proved useful in counteracting improper schemes of the day. That it may ever present such results, and at the same time aid in building up, and promoting pure religion throughout the circle of its influence, is our highest ambition.

That the doctrine of universal efficient grace is rapidly progressing throughout our land, is too palpable to be denied. Let our opposers still exhibit, if they please, the repulsive sneer, and their affected contempt for Universalism. Let them shut up, if they choose, every avenue of approach to their hearers and readers, within their power, as some of them, in the most illiberal and disgraceful manner, have done, and it all will not do. We mind it not, farther than we regret that fellow men, and professing christians, too, will so far degrade themselves. The cause still goes on joyously, and will continue to go, and they will soon awake to a full consideration of the character of their opposition. The proud and haughty pharisee of modern, as well as of ancient times, must and will be humbled!

P.

"They (the papers) excite much interest, and exert a strong counteracting influence upon

the numerous schemes of the day. The tirade of abuse against us, predicated upon the celebrated M'Clure's Lectures, that were so freely used here last winter, has entirely subsided, and I believe the actors are ashamed of their proceedings.

That our cause goes on prosperously, I think cannot be doubted. The able Controversies now pending in our various publications are read with thrilling interest, and must exert a very favorable influence on the public mind. The manner and candor of their arguments reflect great credit on our writers, and conclusively show that a doctrine thus defended, and thus based, must of a consequence, have God as its author.

To pass compliments on our own advocates, may be considered to savor of egotism. But to deny that we are proud of such fearless spirits as are labouring in our cause, would be base ingratitude. We ponder over their productions, and are lost in admiration. Such men as —, and many others, are a blessing to mankind, and an honor to any country, even in this enlightened day and age. Before them the cruel dogmas that have so long withered the best feelings of humanity, are fast passing to their merited oblivion. We say to them, *go on*, and our children, and children's children, will say of them, "good were it for us," that such men lived and labored. C. S. R."

TRUMPET AND UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.

This able coadjutor in our cause commenced its seventh volume, new series, and sixteenth from its commencement, on Saturday last. It retains the same form, and its terms are the same—\$2 per annum, in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within six months. The Trumpet has obtained a deservedly high rank among our periodicals, and needs not our weak recommendation in its favor. That the same indefatigable exertions will be continued to its columns, which have ever been bestowed upon them, may be inferred from the following extract from the introductory remarks of Br. Whittemore:

"Our patrons will be glad to know what course we intend to pursue for the year to come, and what prospects we have of being able to administer to their profit and satisfaction. We assure them, notwithstanding the report that we had renounced Universalism, that our confidence in the truth of this doctrine remains unimpaired. It is the doctrine of the word of God, and all the powers of darkness cannot prove to the contrary. God hath sworn by himself, the word hath gone out of his mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength. This is the doctrine which we undoubtingly believe; and which, as long as we believe it, we shall continue to defend. We shall defend it against the believers in endless misery—against the abettors of fashionable nothingarianism—and against the sentiments and arguments of the cold, bewildered and miserable atheist. We shall defend it by an appeal to the divine character, by the testimony of God's works, of his eternal word, and of the benevolence which he has incorporated into the moral constitution of man. God help us to be faithful in this great and good work. May he give us the pen of a ready writer; may he fill the mind with arguments, and the heart with the love of truth; and may he administer strength according to the duty which he shall call us to perform.

THE DIFFERENCE.

The Reformed Dutch paper of this city is giving a series of articles on the origin of Methodism. This alleged history does not sit well at all on the stomachs of our brethren of the Methodist "Advocate and Journal." The following from their last No. shows pretty clearly the state of the pulse:

"We have just read the *third* number of this pretended history, in the Christian Intelligencer.

We have only to say, at present, that a more vile caricature of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we have seldom seen; and it shews how perfectly easy it is to quote from authorities, and yet distort and misrepresent, and thus turn into a ridiculous point of light the most serious and best of things. If the editor of that paper thinks that he subserves the cause of truth by such slanderous representations of his unoffending neighbors, who have endeavored to live at peace with him, why he must do so. We are of opinion however, that sooner or later, he will regret having permitted a correspondent to impose upon his readers in the manner he has; for the sun of truth, however much it may be darkened for a season with the smoke and dust of error, will at last shine forth to the utter confusion of those who have attempted to intercept its rays. If we do not altogether mistake the feelings of our heart, we indulge in none more painful on the present occasion, than that any Christian editor should feel it his duty to retail such ungenerous and unprovoked reproaches upon a people who at least profess the same religion with himself, and are striving, however humbly and imperfectly, to promote the welfare of mankind through the medium of our common Christianity."

With the general argument of the above we are highly pleased. It is rational, sound doctrine, and we wonder the editors did not, (and it *may* be, they *did*.) experience some twinges of conscience in penning it. We, also, are most clearly "of opinion," that "the sun of truth, however much it may be darkened for a season with the smoke and dust of error, will at last shine forth to the utter confusion of those who have attempted to intercept its rays." "And if we do not altogether mistake," the editors of the Advocate will be among those who will experience a greater or less share of this very confusion. Do they recollect a pitiful attempt, (in an article headed 'Our Neighbor,') "to turn into a ridiculous point of light," a whole denomination professing the same common christianity, with themselves, and who "are striving, however humbly and imperfectly, to promote the welfare of mankind through the medium" of that same christianity? Do they recollect their total neglect to retract before their numerous readers, the base and utterly unfounded slanders contained in that article towards a people who had claims upon them as *men*—if not as *christians*? Do they recollect the manner in which they have "darkened the sun of truth" by the one-sided and illiberal course they have pursued in relation to the Controversy between Messrs. Morse and Lee—in giving their own side of the question and effectually closing their columns against the Universalist arguments, because they dare not let their readers see them?—O, happy art thou, that condemnest not thyself in that thou judgest another!

A PROMPT REBUKE.

How much is it to be regretted, that the royal mandate, noticed below, could not be more generally acted upon by professing christians?

Frederick III, of Prussia, received a petition from one of his districts, praying that a certain clergyman be suspended from preaching, because he held that the punishment of the wicked would come to an end. The king took his pen and wrote the following answer:—"I have considered the above petition, and do hereby give my royal permission to all my loyal subjects to be damned to all eternity, if they choose it—but I do forbid this quarrelling with their neighbors who are not willing to keep their company so long."

THE DISCUSSION.

Br. Whittemore asks, "Where is Dr. Ely?" This question has been propounded to us, directly, in numerous instances within a short time. Whether the Dr. has closed his part of the discussion it is of course not for us to determine. For the satisfaction, however, of the numerous inquirers in the case, and in justice to Dr. Ely, too, we must say, that there may be offered a very reasonable excuse for the delay in his replies to the two last letters of Br. Thomas. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, has held its session during the

time. It has been a long, and if we can judge from a casual glance at its proceedings, a somewhat *stormy* one. Some turbulent spirits are among them. The Assembly has manifestly been undergoing an important revolution, and the New School are evidently getting the ascendancy. Dr. Ely is a prominent individual in the body, having been its Stated Clerk for several years. Of course his attention has been largely occupied with its concerns.

We feel that these circumstances may justly be urged in explanation of the delay, and we are disposed to regard them the principal cause of it, until we are certified to the contrary. We hope the Dr. will avail himself of the earliest opportunity to resume it, for the gratification of the numerous readers of the Discussion. P.

At the meeting of the Boston Association in Lynn, Mass. on the 4th ult. Ordination was conferred on Br. John Hariman, jr. of Gloucester, and Letters of Fellowship granted to Brs. George Hastings and Asa P. Cleverly.

At the Meeting of the Franklin Association in Fayetteville, Vt. on the 4th ult. a Letter of Fellowship was granted to Br. Moses Ballou, and Ordination conferred on Brs. Thomas Wheeler and S. A. Davis.

NEW PERIODICAL.

Br. D. D. Smith, of the Universalist, proposes new monthly periodical under the title of "*The Child's Universalist Gazette, and Monthly Visitor*." To be published monthly, each No. containing 32 12mo pages, stitched and covered, at \$1 per annum in advance. It is intended to contain interesting stories, historical sketches, familiar illustrations of our doctrine, hymns, &c., forming an interesting library for a family of children, or for a Sabbath School. If well conducted, and we doubt not that it will be, it must be found a valuable work. P.

Original.

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

"When men are influenced by their feelings, more than by reason or Revelation, they decide at once, that this doctrine [endless punishment] is inconsistent with the character of God. Many go so far as to affirm with confidence, that it would be unjust for God to suffer his creatures to have an existence, if he *knew* that they would render themselves eternally miserable."—*Christian Instructor*, page 200.

I am really at a loss to determine whether to consider the above remarks of Mr. Hopkins a concession in favor of Universalism, or an argument in favor of Partialism. One thing, however, the Rev. author admits, viz. that the doctrine of endless misery is repugnant to the feelings of man—at least, when his feelings are *unbiased*! The reason which teaches that the finite actions of man deserve an interminable punishment, is not a reasonable kind of reason!!

As to the "Revelation" which instructs man to believe contrary to his feelings, that God will torture a portion of his own offspring without mercy and without end, we presume it is lost and cannot be found!!! A. M.

Married.

In New-York, on the evening of the 19th ult. by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer, Mr. CALVIN W. M. BACON and Miss SARAH ANN BUDDINGTON.

In New-York, on the evening of the 26th ult. by the same, Mr. JAMES TULLEY and Miss JULIA FITCH.

Died.

Suddenly, at Norwalk, on the 6th ult. Mrs. ANNA BYNBER, aged 65. She lived in the practice of pure and undefiled religion, and died in the belief of the gospel of Christ.

Religious Notices.

Br. Le Fevre will preach in Longridge the third Sunday in July—at Deenville in the evening, and at Stamford, Monday evening.

Br. Hillyer will preach in Annsville the first Sunday in July in the morning, at Croton Landing in the afternoon at 3 o'clock, and at Sing Sing in the evening.

Br. S. C. Bulkley will preach to-morrow, Sunday July 1st at Huntington, L. I.

Br. M'Laurin will preach in Monroe, Sunday, July 6th.

MEMORY.

It is fading around me, that shadowy splendor
That haunts the red twilight, the vague and the vain;
Those warm clouds their fugitive blush must surrender,
And colorless melt in the dim air again.
They will leave no remembrance to tell of the glory
Dissolving at sunset away in the west;
They have gone, and the page of the air has no story,
Recalling the beauty with which it was blest.
And thus with our memory—too light are its traces
Of joy or of sorrow experienced of yore;
The shadow of life each soft color effaces,
And the past has one sorrowing echo no more!
Ah! childhood was lovely; but what of its hours,
The bright and the buoyant, what relics have they?
I cannot repaint the green leaves, the glad flowers,
That once made the beauty of earth and of day.
I well can recall the old lime trees hung o'er me,
The bees and the pale blossoms thick o'er each bough;
But the dreams of my future, that brightened before me
What were they? I cannot remember them now.
And youth has no chronicle left of its dreaming,
When hope the sweet alchemist, ruled; and we took
The future on trust, and the present on seeming,
And each old deceit wore a bright and glad look.
Methinks it would make the dark actual less dreary,
Could we call back the feelings we formerly knew;
The path where we loiter for flow'rs is less weary
Than that which speeds on, the goal only in view.
The heart spends its treasure at once; we would cherish
The thought of our feelings, so live them again;
Too early the bright tints of phantasy perish,
And too soon the gilding is worn from life's chain.
Vain, vain this desire for the past! To remember
Is not to recall?—would to heaven that it were!
The second green leaf that may shoot in November
Is but a pale mockery of what was so fair.
The hope that betrayed and the love that deceived us,
Could we live did they keep their first early regrets?
Amid all of which Time in its course has bereaved us,
Well the heart may rejoice in how much it forgets!

CHILDHOOD.

"Oh, give me still the memories
That hallow every scene,
Which stirred my bounding bosom,
When existence all was green."

I love little children. I delight to listen to their innocent prattle, and to take part in their amusements—to feel a community of interest with them, in their little enjoyments and recreations. There is nothing on earth so unaffected, so open, so frank, as childhood. How the light laugh gurgles up from their young and unsophisticated hearts! They have not been out into the world—they have not yet learned to disguise their emotions—to dissemble—to smile, when their hearts are rankling with envy or hate, or weep, when they secretly rejoice. They are as an open book, in which one may read all that they are—all that they feel.

There are not wanting those who have an utter aversion to children—who well nigh hate them. For myself, I want little better evidence of a bad ungenerous heart—and prone as I am to think kindly of my species, I could almost say, "Let no such man be trusted." He can have small enjoyment in himself, and is certainly little calculated to contribute to the happiness of others, who cannot look with pure pleasure upon the innocence and carelessness, and hilarity of youth. To me, the playful sports, the laughing countenance, the beaming eyes of children, unpractised, as yet, in the busy world upon which they are entering with such light hearts—are a complete antidote against ennui or depression of spirits.

I remember, that during a residence of one summer in the city many years ago—for, gentle reader, I am declining into the vale of years—I was, for a few of the first weeks, exceedingly lonely. There is no solitude like the solitude which the stranger feels in a large and populous city. You meet thousands in the thronging streets, all passing on, intent upon their own amusements and avocations—and it is a thousand times more cheerless than to be in the still and solemn forests of the wilderness, or by the solitary shore of the "great and wide sea."—You have there the communings of your own heart, and the almost visible presence of the Maker of the World. But in the city, your

thoughts are confused—their variety leaves you no time to reflect—and they weary you into the very depths of gloom.

One Saturday afternoon, when despondency sat heavy at my heart, I sallied out into the streets. It was the holiday of the thralldom of the school—and their young inmates, neatly dressed, and happier than the king on his throne, were taking their pastime, and rambling with their parents, or elder brothers and sisters, about the streets. I was soon inoculated with their visible happiness, as I met them in my lonely walk. How many bright faces gleamed upon me! You look kindly upon a child, and how soon do they understand you! How their young eyes will beam upon you, and how they will turn—especially little girls—and look at you, and blush, and smile, and pass on a little, and turn and smile, and blush, and look again!

I know not how it is, but in gazing upon children I am actually invested as with a spell. Time and space are annihilated—I am carried back to the morning of life, and, for the moment, live over again the early days of the past.

Before I had reached my room again, I had all the familiar places of my childhood before me. It was "as if I had seized the glass of Time, inverted it, and rolled back the sands which had marked the weary lapse of years." I was again in the meadow—in the field—about the fire-side hearth. My departed father's voice was again in my dreaming ear—my mother's hand was upon my young bed. Again I saw my paper kite, in the gentle south wind, cleaving the upper air—and I gazed upon the same ample sky which spread over my boyhood—

"And marked the passing cloud that dimmed its blue,
Like my own sorrows, then as fleeting and as few!"

It is my earnest prayer, that as I glide slowly down the declivity of years, it will please God to preserve in me that freshness of feeling which enables me to look upon childhood and youth with such purity of enjoyment. It beguiles life of its sombre spirit, "and the weariness of the flesh"—and while it teaches us that we are receding farther from the shore of youth, it reminds us, also, that we are approaching that other shore, where we shall renew an existence of immortal youth. Let all, then, cultivate and cherish these emotions. Let—

"The bright thoughts of early days,
Still gather in our memories now
And not the later cares, whose trace
Is stamped so deeply on the brow;
What though those days return no more?
The sweet remembrance is not vain—
For Heaven is waiting to restore
The childhood of the soul again!"

A FUNERAL IN THE WILDERNESS.

There is something in the very thought of death, considered abstractly, which is not merely repulsive, but absolutely unnatural to the young and the light-hearted. It comes across the mind like a blast of evil, palsying the iron-frame, and bewildering the busy intellect. It seems to the sanguine and buoyant spirit like a contradiction of all its personal experience that the heart can ever become cold to the impulses of affection—that the eye shall kindle no more to the glance of admiration—that the ever-wakeful mind shall become deaf to the voice of interest or the stirrings of ambition—that the hand shall burn no more in the grasp of friendship, nor thrill at the touch of love. Death comes upon our waking vision not merely as the opposite of life, but as the contradiction of its teachings and the dispeller of all its cherished illusions.

But, if such be the meditations inspired by the stern moralist, even on the very theatre of his multiplied and daily repeated triumphs, where the force of the great lesson of morality is diminished by the very frequency of its repetition,

with what a stunning effect must it fall upon the children of the almost unbroken forest, where its occurrence may be the incident of a ten years' sojourn, and where the obstruction of one from the little band who, though separated by the distance of half a day's journey, are yet all that brothers can be to each other; in peril, in sickness, in want, and the thousand circumstances which combine to render the state of an infant settlement more intimately social than any other? Death may summon a victim from the crowded city, and the palsying stroke be unheeded, almost unknown, by the next neighbor of him who has faded from the things of earth; but in the still solitudes of nature, where the grim king has as yet raised no trophies—where the few who gather from a wide circuit to render the parting tribute to a companion in sufferings now past and in hopes just beginning to be realized, while they feel that they can little afford to spare from their scanty numbers, there is a pang which brings a cloud of sadness to the brow, even after years of happiness have intervened to efface the recollection of that hour of poignant and uncontrollable sorrow.

A funeral in the wilderness! The bright sun looks down in joyousness upon that group of thoughtful though swarthy faces now gathered round the rude coffin, in earnest converse on the virtues of the departed, and the dangers and privations they had so often shared with him who now sleeps in unconscious forgetfulness beneath the gaze of devoted friendship, to which his eye should never more kindle. We draw a veil over the deep, passionate grief of that fire-side circle, to which he was all in all. For ever sacred be the sorrow which knows no solace—which fears no aggravation. It is the same in all climes—in all ages—under every variety of circumstance. Time may more quickly efface the recollection amid the hum of business and the bustle of joyous thousands; but that first moment of utter hopelessness sees no bright vistas beyond—knows nought but that Fate's deadliest shaft has been hurled with too true an aim, and that all beyond is unmingled bitterness or rayless despair.

But the services are concluded. The consolations of religion have been tendered to the afflicted, in kindly accents, if not in honeyed words; and the little procession moves on in the deep solemnity of grief to the last resting-place of him who had known or coveted little of rest through his mortal career; and the last gaze is now fixed upon those manly though pallid features, no more to be seen but in the dim twilight of dreams. Slowly and sullenly the earth closes over that iron frame, as if reluctant to claim its too certain prey; and sadly and wistfully the little company now separate, and wend their way to their scattered and distant homes. And yet I pensively lingered around that hallowed spot—for earth has no sanctuary so truly hallowed as that which is consecrated to the sacred repose of the dead. And yet how little of death was there in the character of the glowing scenery around me! The few rude though recent graves could hardly be said to give a character to the narrow enclosure which contained them—while the bright hues of the all-surrounding forest, now gilded by the rays of the setting sun, seemed redolent of life and beauty, and joyousness; and the slight patches of cultivation reclaimed from the long dominion of prolific nature, spake also of the many who were yet to be, rather than of the few who had passed away. But the fading glories of a forest sunset fast deepened into the gloom of twilight; and the murmur of the rising breeze, as it swept through the branches of the aged pines, sounded audibly a dirge for the departed; while the brightening glimmer of the night's pale sentinels pointed soothingly to his deathless home in heaven.—*New-Yorker.*